

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-2, 4-16 and 18-27 are now present in the application. Claims 1-2 and 14-15 have been amended. Claims 1 and 24 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Amendments to the Claims

Applicant has amended Claim 1 to overcome the cited prior art. Specifically, the language of the independent Claim 1 has been amended to explicitly recite that the clips are arranged as successive and non-overlapped "but non-integrated" clips; and to recite "integrating the non-integrated clips with the effects added." Another independent Claim 14 has been similarly amended. This amendment is supported by the originally filed specification, and thus no new matter is added.

Rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-16 and 18-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-2, 4-16 and 18-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's own disclosure in view of Park (U.S. Patent 6,995,805) and Erdelyi (U.S. Patent 6,631,522), or further in view of Zhang (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0112265), or further in view of Matsui (U.S. Patent 6,674,955). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for the following reasons.

The Examiner asserts in paragraph 4 of the Office Action that Applicant's own disclosure (Background, page 2, lines 18-21, Fig. 1A) discloses "selecting and arranging a

plurality of clips, wherein said plurality of clips being arranged as successive and non-overlapped clips” as claimed.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection for the reason that amended claim 1 or 14 is distinct from Applicant’s own disclosure. It is noted that all clips are integrated (step 120 of Fig. 1A) before making mark in points (step 130 of Fig. 1A) in Applicant’s own disclosure, while, in the claimed invention as now amended, the “non-integrated” clips are arranged and the mark in points of the “non-integrated” clips are made **before** the clips are integrated.

Applicant’s own disclosure in Fig. 1B does not disclose the claimed invention, either. Even though the clips are integrated at the final stage (step 170), the clips are not arranged as “successive and non-overlapped” clips as claimed. Instead, clips are **individually** browsed, and mark in points and effects are made **separately** for each clip.

Moreover, according to amended claim 1, the non-integrated clips may include different formats “after the mark in points have been made” as claimed in claim 2. On the contrary, in Applicant’s own disclosure in Fig. 1A, the clips have been integrated before making mark in points. Therefore, the integrated clips cannot have different formats.

For the foregoing reasons, as Applicant’s own disclosure and the other utilized reference fail to disclose the claimed limitations, either alone or in combination (if combinable), it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention is thus patentable over Applicant’s own disclosure and the other utilized references. Independent claim 14 and dependent claim 15 are traversed on the same rationale discussed above.

With respect to dependent claims not specifically mentioned, it is submitted that these claims are patentable not only by virtue of their dependency on their respective base claims, but also for the totality of features recited therein.

For example, with regard to claims 12 and 26, Examiner asserts in the Office Action that the limitation “filtering out said mark in points” would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art even Applicant’s own disclosure and the other utilized references do not disclose this limitation. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As Applicant’s own disclosure requires manual adjustment (see Background, page 1, line 20 through page 2, line 4), it is respectfully submitted that “filtering” is not an option for the Applicant’s own disclosure. It is respectfully submitted that Examiner’s conclusion is without technical basis, and beyond apprehensibility a person skilled in the pertinent art can properly master. The above rationale also applies to the limitation “adjusting said effect duration of said mark in point” in claims 13 and 27.

Accordingly, none of the references utilized by the Examiner individually or in combination teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claims 1 and 14 or their dependent claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 14 and their dependent claims clearly define over the teachings of the references relied on by the Examiner.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but merely to show the state of the prior art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe McKinney Muncy, Registration No. 32,334 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 7, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

for

Ch